

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-32 are pending in the present application.

**I. 35 U.S.C. § 121**

Applicant hereby traverses the restriction requirement and provisionally elects species 1, described by Examiner as characterized by FIG. 8 of the present application. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-7, 9-11, 15, 17-23, 25-27, and 31 are readable on FIG. 8.

For a restriction requirement to be proper, the following requirements must be fulfilled: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct; and (2) there must be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. (MPEP 803.) The particular reasons relied on by the Examiner for holding that the inventions as claimed are either independent or distinct should be concisely stated. A mere statement of conclusion is inadequate. The reasons upon which the conclusion is based should be given. (MPEP 816.)

In the present case, Examiner has required restriction of the claims without an assertion that there is a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required, and without stating why the different embodiments are distinct inventions.

Applicant therefore respectfully submits that Examiner has not made out a *prima facie* case upon which to base restriction.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the Examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 4.24.03

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick C. R. Holmes  
Reg. No. 46,380  
Carstens, Yee & Cahoon, LLP  
P.O. Box 802334  
Dallas, TX 75380  
(972) 367-2001  
Attorney for Applicant